

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

### Corridor Working Group Meeting – Meeting Summary

June 21, 2005

1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Centennial Conference Rooms, North and South  
400 West Gowe Street, Kent 98032

#### Attendees

**WSDOT**

Carol Hunter  
Mike Sallis  
Ron Landon  
Barbara Ivanov

**City of Kent**

Cathy Mooney  
Chad Bieren  
Steve Mullen  
Tim LaPorte

**Perteet**

Loren Sand  
Michael Booth  
Michael Stringam

**City of Auburn**

Dennis Dowdy

**King County**

Ann Martin

**Pierce County**

Cindy Larkin

**EnviroIssues**

Diane Adams  
Kristine dos Remedios

**City of Renton**

Nick Afzali

**Puget Sound Regional Council**

Charlie Howard

#### Welcome and Introductions

Carol Hunter, WSDOT, welcomed the group and thanked them for coming. All attendees introduced themselves and the agency they represent. Diane Adams, EnviroIssues, reviewed the agenda and the contents of the packet distributed to the group, and started the meeting.

#### Regional Transportation Improvement District (RTID) Update

*Carol Hunter, WSDOT*

Carol updated the group on current agency activity with respect to RTID. WSDOT is currently in the process of sorting out funding currently available from the state and what projects still need funding that RTID could potentially cover. Concurrently, the RTID board is discussing what legislative changes are necessary in order to give the board more flexibility with their funding. The board is concerned that there is too much reliance on sales tax, which can be an uncertain funding source.

Loren Sand, Perteet, referred to the first handout in the CWG binder, which was a memo from Shawn Bunney, the RTID board chair. The memo describes proposals on the table with the board as to the funding approach for the RTID ballot next year, and guiding principles for developing such a proposal. The

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

board understands that they need to reach consensus by the end of this year in order to get the package to the legislature.

It is unclear if the RTID board will develop a smaller or larger funding package than in years before. Based on Shawn Bunney's memo, the package is about 80% of the funding as the year prior. However, the level of investment for the King and Pierce county areas is the same as last year. Therefore, even if the RTID package is smaller in the coming year, the same level of investment is projected for the SR 167 corridor, which is shown as \$510 million in the memo. An RTID work plan's release is anticipated soon.

### Discussion Topics:

- Tim LaPorte, City of Kent, stated that the \$510 million dollar figure in the memo for SR 167 was not a South County Area Transportation Board (SCATBd) recommendation. That number was driven down from a SCATBd estimate a year ago in April. This number is a starting point but there is still a lot of discussion about what that number should be.
- Charlie Howard, PSRC, informed that group that the House transportation committee has also asked PSRC to put together a group in order to have a broader discussion about transportation in the region, and in order to develop a legislative package with a more regional approach. This group will function in parallel to the RTID work, which is mandated by law. The other group, called the Leadership Group, is comprised of private sector leadership, leadership from the transportation partnership, as well as members of the PSRC executive board.

### Revised Decision Structure

*Carol Hunter, WSDOT*

Carol referred to the handout in the CWG binder called Roles and Responsibilities. WSDOT has made some improvements to this decision structure, based on discussions at the May SR 167 CWG meeting. Representatives from the valley cities, including Puyallup, Fife, Auburn and Kent are now included in the Executive Advisory Group. The Executive Advisory Group is intended to meet at major milestones of the corridor plan in order to offer guidance to the project team as it makes recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation.

The revised structure also includes more information about what each group is responsible for as well as who is included in each group, in response to a request made at the last meeting.

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

### Discussion

- Dennis Dowdy, City of Auburn, asked WSDOT to clarify how often each group meets. Carol explained that the Leadership Group and the Executive Advisory Group only meet at major milestones during the SR 167 corridor planning process. The Corridor Working Group will meet monthly. The Process and Schedule handout in the CWG binder outlines the frequency of each group's meetings at the bottom. Initially, WSDOT expected the CWG to take the summer off, but due to the timing of the RTID process, the group decided to push forward through the summer in order to identify projects to put forward to RTID for the SR 167 corridor.

### Screening Criteria

*Michael Stringam and Michael Booth, Perteet*

Michael Stringam directed the group to the handout in the CWG binder titled 'Suggested SR 167 Corridor Study Screening Criteria.' These criteria were developed using the criteria used in the previous SR 167 study.

A criterion of improving 'Truck Mobility and Efficiency' was added in order to address the importance of mobility in the SR 167 corridor. The sub-criteria in this category include hours of truck travel and travel time for large and medium trucks.

A separate line item under 'Improve Safety' was also added to address truck accidents and truck safety. It was the goal of the team to add this criterion in order to make sure any proposed route improvements are sensitive to trucks and their maneuvering needs, such as increased turning radii.

In addition, the project team suggests that the 'Reduce Congestion' criterion be combined with the 'Save Time' criterion. Both of these criterion addressed operational functions of the corridor and created some double counting of the same measures.

For the first criterion of 'Move More People,' the team suggests that peak hour measurements be used instead of daily, as this focuses more on the commuter trip times.

The group agreed to the suggested changes made by the project team and recommended others, outlined in the following discussion.

### Discussion:

- Ann Martin, King County, asked if the travel time measures under the truck mobility/efficiency criterion were daily or peak travel time. Michael S.

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

said their team was leaning towards using daily hours of travel, as travel time for trucks is critical all day long.

- Barbara Ivanov, WSDOT, asked how the team defined large or medium trucks. Michael S. said that medium trucks were defined as trucks with more than two axles. Large trucks were considered to be semi trucks, or tractor-trailer units.
- Barb Ivanov, WSDOT, suggested that under the safety criterion, that a reduction in truck accidents also be added as a measure, in addition to truck access. There is a potential for safety issues for trucks with improvements such as new on and off ramps, where enough room to allow trucks to get up to speed or slow down are incorporated into the design.
- Barb Ivanov, WSDOT, asked how truck travel time would be measured. Michael S. explained that there was an industry wide standard that estimated the average hourly cost for truck travel time, which is what would be used as the measurement. If there is a localized standard for the hourly cost of truck travel time, the team will use that instead.
- Charlie Howard, PSRC, suggested that an efficiency measure should also be added into the truck mobility and efficiency criterion. Specifically, the ease of access of trucks in the corridor facility and how easy is it for trucks to maneuver in the system. It was agreed that this measure should be added under the truck mobility section.
- Ann Martin, King County, asked the team to clarify if peak, under the 'Move More People' criterion, was peak period or peak hour. Ann suggested that this be specifically defined wherever the term 'peak' is used in the criteria. Michael S. said that peak should be peak period and that change will be made.
- Tim LaPorte, City of Kent, asked if new traffic counts were going to be taken for this study and if so, during what time of year would these counts be made. Tim suggested that counts be taken during the non-summer months when school is in session, when congestion is heavier.
- Dennis Dowdy, City of Auburn, asked if counts would be taken of just medium and large trucks using the corridor. Carol shared that this would be done, as accurate and up to date counts will be important for the analysis. Normally weigh station data was used for this but there are no stations along SR 167, so these counts will be taken in the field.
- Cindy Larkin, Pierce County, inquired why there was not a criterion regarding reducing traffic on local arterials. The project should consider

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

how the local community is affected by proposed changes or improvements on SR 167. Projects that reduce traffic on local arterials and enhance traffic flow in local communities should be favored. The group agreed that this should be added to the list of criteria.

Michael Booth, Perteet, then went over the changes made to the environmental criterion. Again, the criteria were developed using the criteria used for the previous SR 167 study. The criteria were not changed substantially. A few key environmental regulations have been developed and new information has surfaced that have been reflected in the revised criteria. Overall, there is a greater emphasis in the criteria regarding cultural, environmental justice, and watershed or critical areas issues.

In regard to the 'Water Quality and Quantity' measure under the 'Be Environmentally Responsive,' the review of previous documents now includes a review of the information being collected by the watershed basin level planning in which WSDOT is currently engaged.

Cultural resources have also been called out more specifically in the revised criteria, including the addition of Section 106 requirements, which didn't exist when the original criteria were developed.

Environmental justice issues have also been added into the criteria, which will include a review of census data in order to identify low income, minority groups, and other special populations that may be affected by corridor issues or improvements.

The group agreed to the suggested changes made by the project team and recommended others, outlined in the following discussion.

### **Discussion:**

- Charlie Howard, PSRC, pointed out that flooding is an issue in the valley and that a consideration of flood relief should be added under the 'Water Quality and Quantity' measure.
- Dennis Dowdy, City of Auburn, agreed that there are many proactive things that can be done to benefit the area fisheries, improve the drainage in the valley, and manage stormwater. The corridor alternatives should either take advantage of the resource created by the increased stormwater in the valley, due to human development, or help manage it in some way.
- Carol Hunter, WSDOT, shared that soil liquefaction is also an issue in the valley and projects will be subject to more stringent design standards and face retrofit issues.

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

- Barb Ivanov, WSDOT, asked where the study area extends to in the south. Carol explained that the SR 167 corridor study extends to where the SR 167 extension project begins, near SR 512.
- Ann Martin, King County, asked how distinctions will be made for the different types of transit along the corridor, including bus and commuter rail. In addition, how will I-5 and SR 509 be taken into consideration, as these routes do have an impact on freight mobility and the function of the SR 167 corridor, and how will the new connection to SR 167 in Pierce county be taken into account. Michael S. explained that the PSRC model will be used and the relationships between SR 167 and future improvements and nearby corridors are incorporated into that model. Transit is accounted for by using the HOV 3+ person trips number in the model, which takes into account transit trips.
- Ann Martin, King County, asked if the land use assumptions being used for the SR 167 model are similar to those being used by the SR 164 and SR 169 projects that are also currently in progress. Michael S. said that this comparison is being done in order to ensure consistency. It was found that local jurisdictions are a little out of sync with the PSRC model, as they function on a more detailed level of land use. The project team is aware that a meeting was held between local jurisdictions and PSRC, in regard to the SR 164 and SR 169 studies, to discuss these land use assumptions and changes made to the PSRC model or local models will be incorporated into the SR 167 model.
- Tim LaPorte, City of Kent, said that the PSRC model assumes that Sound Transit will and can add additional Sounder trains but it is unclear whether or not Burlington Northern has the capacity to allow these additional trains. Tim asked if there is an agreement between Sound Transit and Burlington Northern that allow us to accurately assume that Sound Transit can and will add additional commuter trains. This is a concern because freight is also expanding along this rail corridor and is expected to double if not triple in the coming year. Charlie Howard, PSRC, said that these commuter rail additions are projections at this time but Sound Transit is making investments to buy round trip service capacity along this corridor.
- Michael S., Perteet, commented that there was a strong interest among the group about the details of the model. The group agreed that a CWG session to discuss the assumptions of the model being used would be beneficial.
- Tim LaPorte, City of Kent, asked Michael B. if air quality should be a separate parameter under the 'Be Environmentally Responsive.' Michael B. agreed that this would be a fair addition to the list of criterion, especially with the amount of freight traffic and congestion in the corridor.

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

- Charlie Howard, PSRC, made the point that it will be important for the study to show that corridor improvements along SR 167 do not promote sprawl but in fact support the urban centers of the region, such as Kent and Auburn, that already exist in the urban growth area.
- Cindy Larkin, Pierce County, asked if weighting of the criteria would be discussed. The project team said that these criteria were not intended to be weighted, as the corridor plan is a preliminary evaluation of options in order to come up with recommendations for improvements along SR 167. However, this issue can be discussed further at the next CWG meeting.

The group agreed that the suggestions provided during the discussion on the screening criteria should be integrated into the next draft of the criteria. The project team committed to making the suggested changes and providing a second draft at the next CWG meeting for the group's approval.

### Potential Project Discussion

*Loren Sand, Perteet*

Loren Sand, Perteet, directed the group to the map of SR 167 potential bottleneck projects in their CWG binder. This map includes all projects that the team has heard about in the SR 167 Corridor plan study area, either through RTID discussions or from CWG members. Loren asked that partners review this list of projects in order to identify any other projects not currently included on this map. This list of projects will then be the list of projects that are prioritized, using the screening criteria. The first phase of the SR 167 corridor study looked at major corridor improvements. The focus of the second phase will be bottleneck projects and other critical improvements to the corridor. Not all projects on this list are funded.

- Barb Ivanov, WSDOT, identified a correction to the map. For SR 18 Interchange project, the description should read "Add missing ramps eastbound SR 18 to southbound SR 167 and northbound SR 167 to westbound SR 18."
- Nick Afzali, City of Renton, pointed out that the I-405 improvements are funded by both the 2005 Transportation Partnership Account as well as the Nickel Package and should be reflected on the map.
- Barb Ivanov, WSDOT, suggested that the Pierce County SR 167 project alignment be added to the map. Loren explained that two different maps would be made in the future. One showing funded projects and the other showing unfunded projects. The Pierce County project will be added when those maps are made.

## SR 167 Corridor Plan

### Public Outreach Update

*Diane Adams, EnviroIssues*

Diane Adams, EnviroIssues, provided a brief update on public outreach activities to date. The team is in the process of finalizing the Public Involvement Plan for this phase of the SR 167 corridor study.

The team has attended two farmers markets to date, including the Kent Farmers Market and the Renton Farmers Market. A copy of the SR 167 project folio was distributed at these events and staff provided information on the project schedule. The public has shown an interest in the study at these events and the reactions have been generally positive. Most citizens who approached the booth just wanted information and were happy to see that WSDOT was doing something to address the issues in the SR 167 corridor. The team plans to attend the Kent Farmers Market on June 25<sup>th</sup> and the Renton Farmers Market on June 28<sup>th</sup>.

Upcoming outreach activities also include staffing informational booths at the Kent Cornucopia Days festival, Renton River Days festival, and the Auburn Good Ol' Days festival. WSDOT will also have an informational booth at the King County fair, where SR 167 project information will be distributed.

### Discussion

- Cindy Larkin, Pierce County, asked whether or not the team plans to attend any events in Pierce County. Diane encouraged her to suggest events that may be appropriate outreach opportunities and the team will make every effort to attend those in addition to the other planned outreach activities.
- Barb Ivanov, WSDOT, asked what the purpose of the initial public outreach was. Carol explained that the outreach is meant to get the word out that this corridor study is being done, provide some background information on what WSDOT is doing, and to solicit comments on what the public would like to see in terms of improvements along the corridor.
- Tim LaPorte, City of Kent, asked when a newsletter would be distributed along the corridor. Diane said that the first newsletter would most likely be published before the first round of open houses in the fall.

### Next steps:

- Carol Hunter, WSDOT, said that she has been in contact with Nytasha Sowers, the project manager for the SR 167 HOT lanes pilot project. They have discussed using the SR 167 CWG as a sounding board for the SR 167 HOT lanes project as well, in order to take advantage of the



## SR 167 Corridor Plan

group's time. The CWG group agreed that this was a good idea and that they would act as an advisory group to the SR 167 HOT lanes project.

- The topics for the next meeting will include a discussion on the revised screening criteria, goals and objectives, and modeling assumptions
- The project team agreed to coordinate with local jurisdictions and the SR 164 and SR 169 corridor study regarding land use assumptions used in modeling.
- The CWG was asked to compile a list of projects that need to be added to the list of projects presented.
- CWG members agreed that meeting in Kent the third Tuesday of every month worked for them.

**Next Meeting:** 7/19/05, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.  
Centennial Conference Rooms, Centennial Building  
400 W. Gowe Street, Kent